O.S. 1001

(3) (4)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BILASPUR

CHHATTISGARH

WRIT PETITION No. 4502 /2005

PETITIONER : Rajesh Kumar Pandit aged about 47 years S/o. Mohan Lal Pandit Range Officer (Forest), Belgahana, R/o. Belgahana, Distt. Bilaspur (C.G.).

Civil No. 4502/05 Presented by Shri Uttam Pandey dated 13/9/05

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, through Special Secretary, Forest Department, Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (Chhattisgarh).

2. Principal Chief Conservator of Forest, Aranya Bhavan, Jail Road, Raipur.

3. Shri R.C.Raigar, Inquiry Officer, Chief Conservator (Forest) Official address -- Aranya Bhavan, Jail Road, Raipur.

4. Shri Harihar Narayan Singh, C/o. Inquiry Officer, Shri R.C.Raigar, Office of the Chief Conservator (Forest) Aranya Bhavan, Jail Road, Raipur.

RECEIVED COPY 13.9.05 CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

वनपथ आयुक्त बिलासपुर (छ.ग.) बिलासपुर तहसील सेल

(4) (2)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF APPROPRIATE WRIT/ORDER OR DIRECTION.

XI-HC-78

(30)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... WP No. 4502/05 ..... **सन् 200**

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	21.9.2005 Shri Uttam Pandey, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Sandeep Dubey, Govt. Adv. for the State. By this writ petition the petitioner, who is working as Range Officer in the Forest Department, State of Chhattisgarh, has prayed for quashment of the order dated 13.4.2005 (Annexure P-1) whereby respondent No.1-the Special Secretary, Forest Department, State of Chhattisgarh has asked respondent No.3 to enquire into the allegations made in the complaint dated 23.1.2005 and to direct respondent No.2 to enquire into the allegations made by the petitioner herein in his letter dated 10.8.2005 (Annexure P-6). Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is not aware about the contents of complaint-dated 23.1.2005, which has been entrusted to respondent No.3-Shri R.C. Raigar for conducting the enquiry. Further argument of learned counsel for the petitioner is that respondent No.3 is not conducting the enquiry in a fair manner and he has threatened the petitioner that if he will not co-operate in the enquiry, he will suspend him. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner, I have perused the petition. So far, a preliminary enquiry is being conducted by respondent No.3 and whatever notices are issued, the petitioner is at liberty to	

Dai

XI-HC-78

(31)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश —2—	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	reply of those notices and thereafter, if any irregularity in the enquiry is found then he will be at liberty to raise the same at the appropriate stage. However, at the stage of preliminary enquiry it is not appropriate for this Court to quash the enquiry or stay the enquiry by invoking extra-ordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, the petition is liable to be dismissed and it is, accordingly, dismissed. Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.3652/05 and I.A. No.8080/05 also stand dismissed. **Sd/-** **L.C. Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Keshav/-